

Serial Number: 10/006,027
Art Unit: 1744

REMARKS

1. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claims 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite.

Claim 18 has been amended to remove the offending term "ALCALASE". Thus, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

2. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102

Riehle et al. US 6,554,961 or US 2003/0205345

The office action asserts that Riehle (US 6554961) discloses a process for rendering a polyamine-epihalohydrin resin storage stable, that includes treating a composition containing a wet strength polyamine-epihalohydrin resin, the composition comprising a solids content of at least 15% (21%, see example 75) and including CPD-forming species, with at least one enzymatic agent under conditions to at least one of inhibit, reduce and remove the CPD-forming species to obtain a gelation storage stable reduced CPD-forming resin so that the composition containing the reduced CPD-forming polyamine-epihalohydrin resin when stored for 24 hours at 50 deg C, and a pH of about 1.0 release less than about 250 ppm dry basis of CPD (See Example 75 and Table 31). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

In Example 75 of US 6554961, the UNTREATED resin has a solids content of 21% however BEFORE treatment the resin is diluted (see col. 89, lines 51-55) In Table 31, the first col. 1- first row shows an UNTREATED resin all enzyme treated resins were at a 13.5% solids content. Applicants therefore submit that to treat a resin with a solids content of above 15 %, which is claimed in the present invention, is not taught in Riehle US 6554961.

Serial Number: 10/006,027
Art Unit: 1744

All dependent claims, claims 2-13, 14-16 and 18-25, 34-36 are dependant directly or indirectly on claim 1 or 36 which require that the solids content be a least 15% or greater. Riehle US 6554961 does not teach the high solids content. Therefore any claims that include the limitation of the high solids content are not anticipated by the reference of Riehle US 6554961.

Thus, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

3. Rejection: Double patenting

a) Claims 2-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as claiming the same invention as co pending Application 10/013,049.

It is noted that co pending Application 10/013,049 has a filing date of December 10, 2001, which is after December 7, 2001, the filing date of the present application.

For a same invention double patenting rejection the Office Action must show that the claims in the issued patent, in this case co-pending application, and the pending patent can not be literally infringed without literally infringing one another.

Claim 1 of co-pending application is being amended to include an additional limitation not found in the claims of the present application. It is believed that this additional limitation, which becomes part of all of the dependant claims, overcomes the rejection based on 25 U.S.C. §101. The claims of the present application can be practiced without necessarily literally infringing the claims of the co-pending application. Thus, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

b) Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claim 1 of co-pending Appl. No. 10/013,049. The focus of a double patenting analysis is on the claims (MPEP 804). Claim 1 of

Serial Number: 10/006,027
Art Unit: 1744

co-pending application No. 10/013,049 is being amended to include a further limitation that is not taught in the claims of the present application. Therefore the claims of the co-pending application are not as amended obvious in light of the present application. Thus, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

c) Claim 1-25 and 34-36 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claim 1 of co-pending Appl. No. 10/396,155. Applicants contend that the present invention is patentable over the cited art as being unexpected. It is Applicants' contention that a person skilled in the art would not have expected that the process of the present invention could be accomplished at higher solids contents, see page 40, line 27 to page 41, line 41 of the present application.

"It was NOT (emphasis added) expected that biodehalogenation could be accomplished at high solids concentration due to lack of water for the microorganisms, higher osmotic pressure for higher solids content, and undefined problems, such as concentration of low molecular weight species. Moreover, it would be expected that pretreatment to remove higher residuals may be needed, such as by dilution or filtration. Moreover, it would NOT (emphasis added) be expected that biodehalogenation could be achieved in a reasonable period of time, such as within 48 hours. Still further, there would be an EXPECTATION OF STORAGE INSTABILITY AT HIGH SOLIDS concentrations (emphasis added); however, the resin compositions according to the present invention are storage stable, and are not susceptible to gelling. The

Serial Number: 10/006,027
Art Unit: 1744

advantages of the present invention are obtained for high solids whether or not the resin composition is treated to remove or reduce CPD-forming species."

The focus of a double patenting analysis is on the claims (MPEP 804).

The claims of co-pending Appl. No. 10/396,155 do not teach or suggest treating a resin with a solids content of greater than 15% with an enzymatic agent.

Therefore the present application is not an obvious variation of the co-pending appl. 10/396,155.

For these reasons, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

It is submitted that the foregoing reply is completely responsive under 37 CFR 1.111 and that all grounds of rejection and objection have been completely overcome or obviated. It is submitted that all claims are now in condition for allowance and a notice of allowance for all pending claims is respectfully requested.

An extension of time has been filed with this amendment.

An additional dependant claim has been added. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the claim fee of 18 dollars to deposit account 08-1800.

Beyond the extension of time and the additional dependant claim fee it is believed that there are no additional fees required for entry of this amendment or for maintaining the pendency of this application. If there are any additional fees required to have this

Jun. 15. 2004 4:40PM

No. 3242 P. 14

Serial Number: 10/006,027
Art Unit: 1744

amendment entered or to keep the application pending the commissioner is hereby
authorized to change the fee to deposit account number 08-1800.

Should there be any questions or comments regarding this paper or the present
application, Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below listed telephone
number.

Sincerely,



Joanne Mary Fobare Rossi
Reg. No. 43,061
Attorney for Applicant
302 594-5833

Hercules Incorporated
Hercules Plaza
1313 N. Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19894-0001